

Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, December 5, 2011

The Arizona State Board of Education held a regular meeting at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 W. Jefferson St., Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:04am.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. Tyree

ROLL CALL

Ms. Hickman

Members Present:

Ms. Amy Hamilton

Supt. Huppenthal

Ms. Eileen Klein

Mr. Greg Miller

Mr. Jacob Moore

Ms. Diane Ortiz-Parsons

Dr. James Rottweiler

Mr. Tom Tyree

Members Absent:

Dr. Vicki Balentine

Mr. Jaime Molera

1. BUSINESS REPORTS

A. President's Report

Mr. Tyree

1. Appointment of nominating committee to prepare a slate of candidates for 2012 Board officers

9:05am - Vice President Tyree explained that President Molera talked to three Members about presenting a slate of officers at the January meeting: Ms. Klein, Dr. Balentine and Mr. Miller.

B. Superintendent's Report

Supt. Huppenthal

1. ELL Teacher of the year

9:06am - Supt. Huppenthal gave an award to the 2011 ELL Teacher of the Year. Supt. Huppenthal shared that when he went to the school where Mrs. Jennifer Glueck teaches, it was remarkable because when he announced her name, the students erupted with joy for their teacher being recognized for the great work she is doing with them.

Mrs. Glueck has taught for ten years as a first grade teacher at Camelview Elementary School in the Madison School District. Supt. Huppenthal thanked Mrs. Glueck for the work that she does and for the joy that she has given her students. Supt. Huppenthal commented that Mrs. Glueck's success was a process of teamwork at a great school with a great principal, and that there was clearly great support for a teacher who has a passion for kids. Supt. Huppenthal thanked Mrs. Glueck and her team for their work.

Supt. Huppenthal continued his report by stating that the ADE had recently acknowledged the AP Scholars of the Year: Timothy Lee from Desert Vista High School in Tempe Union High School District, Joyce Zhang from Basha High School in Chandler Unified School District, and Trey Todnem from the Accelerated Learning Laboratory Secondary School, a charter school in Tucson.

Supt. Huppenthal stated that the ADE is continuing its work with the Governor's office with the Race to the Top applications. As part of that process, the priorities are getting the computer system fixed at the ADE because so many districts rely on it. There is also potential for the ADE website to be a driver for improving the education system. The ADE website gets over one million views a month.

Lastly, Supt. Huppenthal stated that the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores were released a couple weeks ago. Arizona is ranked third from the top with regards to gain points. Overall, however, Arizona stayed in 42nd place. Supt. Huppenthal further stated that being third is good, but not nearly good enough, and that Arizona has a substantial margin to close before reaching the number one spot.

Vice President Tyree commented that the NAEP results are on the consent agenda, however, it might be in the interests of the Board to see more information about the report at a later Board meeting.

Supt Huppenthal responded that the vision is to not only post where Arizona ranks on student scores, but to adjust the data for demographics and income. Arizona's schools rank 21st when the adjustment for demographics and income is made. Supt. Huppenthal concluded that it means Arizona is doing mediocre in a mediocre nation, and that it is important to be scientific in the approach to data.

C. Board Member Reports

9:15am - Ms. Klein stated that she had been privileged to speak at Larry C. Kennedy School during Teach for America Week. Ms. Klein commented on the fact that during the opening remarks, the presenters talked about how the school received a ranking of B in the new A-F School Accountability Letter Grade System, and that the school is working hard to become an A school. Ms. Klein stated that this was the kind of motivation people have been hoping to see around the new letter grade system. It was clear to Ms. Klein that the students are connected to the system and their part in contributing to the success of their school. Ms. Klein gave a special thank you for allowing her the opportunity to speak to them and she offered her congratulations on a great program that is making sure kids are connected to education goals.

Ms. Klein also wanted to give a special thank you to Supt. Huppenthal. Governor Brewer has asked for an AZ Ready committee, which is a revamp of the Governor's P-20 council, to be chaired by Dr. Craig Barret, and co-chaired by Supt. Huppenthal. Ms. Klein stated that she is very excited about the initiative, and she appreciates Supt. Huppenthal's willingness to participate and bring transparency.

Ms. Ortiz-Parsons shared that she attended the Robotics Lego Competition of the East Valley. Ms. Ortiz-Parsons congratulated Goodrich and the other corporations who were willing to sponsor teams. Ms. Ortiz-Parsons stated that she was encouraged for the future and that she appreciated the opportunity to attend the competition.

D. Director's Report

Mr. Yanez

1. Calendar dates for 2012
2. Update on Topock Elementary

9:19am - Mr. Yanez began by stating that the Members had been given a list of dates for the 2012 Board meetings and that the next Board meeting is on January 23rd, 2012.

Mr. Yanez then went on to explain how at the last Board meeting there had been some discussion regarding the Uniform System of Financial Records (USFR) non-compliance of the Topock Elementary School District. Mr. Yanez proceeded with a brief update. There had been difficulties between the school district and the audit firm with regards to completing the 2009 audit questionnaire. The audit has been completed, as confirmed by the district superintendent, although Mr. Yanez is still waiting for the official notice from the Auditor General's office that is has been received.

Mr. Yanez had been informed last week that the audit was completed, and the district superintendent informed Mr. Yanez that he believes the internal control deficiencies that were noted in the 2007 audit have been corrected. Assuming Mr. Yanez receives confirmation from the Auditor General this week, Mr. Yanez will request that the Auditor General conduct the status review to verify that the 2007 deficiencies have been corrected and that the 2009 audit questionnaire has been submitted.

If everything pans out, this item will not be on the agenda for the January 23rd meeting. Mr. Yanez will update the Board at the January meeting.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| A. Consideration to approve State Board of Education minutes for October 24, 2011 | Mr. Yanez |
| B. Consideration to approve trainers for the Full Structured English Immersion Endorsement | Ms. Hrabluk |
| C. Consideration to accept funds from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to operate child nutrition programs and to authorize allocation of funds in accordance with federal regulations | Ms. Szafranski |
| D. Consideration to approve the alternative preparation program applications for the following organizations:
1. Arizona Teaching Fellows (Secondary Education)
2. ABCTE (Elementary, Secondary and Principal Programs) | Ms. Amator |
| E. Consideration to appoint the following individuals to the Certification Advisory Committee:
1. Dr. Manuel Valenzuela
2. Mr. Jac Heiss | Mr. Yanez |
| F. Consideration to appoint the following individuals to the Career Ladder Advisory Committee:
1. Denise Ryan
2. Julia Ragonese-Barwell
3. Dr. Nancy Fiandach
4. Dr. Pam Santesteban
5. Anna Montalbo
6. Lisa Kelley
7. Jim Bailey
8. Penny Kotterman
9. Michelle Covarrubias
10. Teresa Gorman
11. William Lawson
12. Daniela Robles
13. Deanna Day | Ms. Amator |
| G. Consideration to accept the voluntary surrender of the teaching certificates of the following individuals:
1. George Keene
2. Qikai Chen
3. Camella Caudill | Mr. Easaw |
| H. Consideration to accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and grant the application for certification for Darren Plier | Mr. Easaw |

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| I. Consideration to revoke the teaching certificates held by Rosanna E. Brown, pursuant to ARS § 15-550 | Mr. Easaw |
| J. Receipt of the 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results | Ms. Pollnow |
| K. Receipt of annual report regarding the Move On When Ready Initiative, pursuant to ARS § 15-792.02 | Dr. Francis |

9:22am - Mr. Yanez requested that Item 2D2 be tabled.

Ms. Hamilton noted that with regards to Item 2G2, Mr. Chen had been a student teacher at Ms. Hamilton's school, but she did not know him.

Dr. Rottweiler stated that because of a potential conflict of interest regarding item 2H he would abstain from voting on the consent agenda.

*Supt. Huppenthal moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the noted exceptions and tabling of Item 2D2.
Second by Mr. Miller
Motion passed unanimously*

3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No requests to speak.

4. GENERAL SESSION

- A. Presentation and discussion regarding 2012 legislative priorities:
 - 1. Arizona Department of Education

Ms. Morley

9:25am - Ms. Morley, ADE Director of Policy Development and Government Affairs, stated the ADE is looking at a bill that was passed that will change the way student counts are done; a 40 day ADM count versus 100 days of ADM, which would have a big effect on counting students and funding. The ADE is looking at how to make it better so it will more accurately reflect the number of students in schools.

The ADE is also looking at proposing a corporate tax credit for public schools to implement strategic investments for technology and transformative practices. It would allow the ADE to grant money out to schools and put innovative and different tools into the classroom. The ADE is looking for evidence based proposals to come into the department which will provide a way for businesses to invest in education. The corporate tax credit would also provide the ADE with a laboratory to see what works and what does not work. If it works really well, then the ADE might be able to disseminate that out to the entire state.

Supt. Huppenthal stated that he would like an estimate on how much resources are available, and given that number, what would be fair to argue for, knowing what the benchmark is.

Ms. Morley replied that she does not know what the projections are on revenue. She stated that she does know that the ADE is talking about coming up above what the estimates were for Fiscal Year 2012, and that the priorities at the Legislature are to pay down some of the debt. Ms. Morley further stated that the Legislature is not looking at doing any restoration, but hopefully there will be no further cuts. Ms. Morley concluded that it

depends on what the fiscal outlook is really looking like.

2. Arizona Education Association

Mr. Thomas

9:30am - Mr. Thomas, Vice President of the Arizona Education Association (AEA), spoke about what AEA members are feeling and seeing at the ground level, with regards to policies enacted by the Legislature and State Board. AEA's proposed legislative agenda involves a desire to see a systemic approach to policy around public education, of which AZ Ready and the Governor's P-20 Council are good examples.

Mr. Thomas said that AEA wants to see sound education policies that meet high standards. They want to see necessary and adequate funding, and make sure there is fairness and respect for the people that work every day to carry out policies passed at the Legislature. Lastly, AEA wants to maintain a fair and secure retirement system through the Arizona State Retirement System (ASRS).

There are four basic areas under these goals: quality teaching, quality learning, the ability to increase teacher core knowledge and quality professional development. AEA wants to make sure the ability to increase teacher core knowledge begins in college with good teacher preparation programs, strong certification programs at the state level, and at the district level with good mentor programs, career development and evaluations, and fair compensation structures.

Mr. Thomas commented that funding is a dodgy subject, but it is what defines the resources, and what teachers are able to do with students in their classes. AEA would like to work with the Legislature to be creative; to make sure there are the necessary resources available to provide adequate class size and a challenging curriculum, and to provide students with the opportunities that rhetoric talks about.

Mr. Thomas concluded by stating that teachers want a fair dismissal process. AEA wants to have the opportunity to talk about what is fair with regards to high accountability and realistic objectives. AEA wants to make sure the evaluation system is used for what it was designed for, which is to increase teaching and learning in the classroom. Lastly, Mr. Thomas repeated that AEA is interested in the long term health of the ASRS. AEA will be happy to have conversations about ASRS and would like to make sure their voice is at the table.

3. Arizona School Administrators Association

Dr. Duvall

9:36am - Dr. Duvall, Executive Director of the Arizona School Administrators, introduced ASA's legislative liaison, Sabrina Vasquez. ASA has yet to adopt a legislative agenda, but is scheduled to do so on December 15th.

Ms. Vasquez stated that ASA uses four guiding principles to assess new policies and determine advocacy positions. These are local control, equality, economics and balance.

ASA's main goal is to ensure that all districts and charters successfully implement all new reforms. Because of this, ASA will urge the Legislature to give districts and charters adequate time to successfully implement current reforms before adding additional mandates. Another of ASA's main priorities is the successful implementation of teacher and principal evaluations. In order to give school districts and charters a greater opportunity at success, ASA will support an extension in the timeline for the implementation of teacher and principal evaluations, if benchmarks are put in place to ensure that any district or charter that utilizes the extension will be in compliance by the extended date.

ASA's second agenda item is the utilization of excess revenues for the 2012-2013 school year. If consideration is given to the distribution of these increased revenues, ASA will advocate for the use of the additional funds by

urging the Legislature to fully fund the inflation factor for the M&O Soft Capital and Facilities portion of the education formula.

Lastly, ASA will support any legislative effort to reduce administrative paperwork burden, by finding additional ways to suspend or eliminate costly administrative statutory requirements, for example, ARS § 15-239, which is the statutory requirement that ADE duplicate the Auditor General's audit.

Ms. Vasquez concluded by stating that ASA is eager to continue working with the SBE, Supt. Huppenthal and ASA's partner education associations, to provide staff and administration with the necessary support needed to ensure that all Arizona students are given an excellent education.

Supt. Huppenthal commented that he would like to sit down with ASA, the Auditor General and the ADE audit department to work out the overlap and come together on that legislative initiative to determine how to best get organized. Supt. Huppenthal affirmed that it would be helpful to discuss the issues, and understand the overlap and how best to manage it.

Ms. Vasquez replied that ASA would set that up.

4. Arizona School Boards Association

Dr. Essigs

9:42am - The ASBA 2012 Political Agenda was handed out to the Board Members. This year their number one priority is to ensure that college and career readiness programs are available to all students in the state. Dr. Essigs also stated that it is important to the ASBA that local options remain available to school districts where citizens can vote to pass override or bond elections to supplement funding the state provides.

Dr. Essigs shared that ASBA thinks this is an excellent opportunity to reduce administrative burden that is put on districts that is not value-added. It is ASBA's hope that the SBE and the Legislature can work together with school districts to eliminate some of those things that do not do anything to move Arizona forward and that take time and effort at the local community level.

Lastly, Dr. Essigs thanked the SBE for working with school districts to hear what they have to say. Dr. Essigs stated that more gets done if the education stakeholder groups work together and listen to each other.

9:46am - Vice President Tyree stated there was a request for a Call to the Public.

Ms. Hill, from Stand for Children, commented on the issue of education evaluations.

Ms. Hill shared with the board that in 2010 Stand for Children worked closely with the Legislature to encourage the legislators, the Governor's Office and the Race to the Top team in their work on educator evaluations and to help put something in statute that would create certainty and consistency in terms of the implementation. Stand for Children also worked to make sure the evaluations were substantive and meaningful, not just in how they were designed but in how they were used. Stand for Children focused on designing a framework, making sure everyone knew what the framework was, and allowing the year and a half that was in statute for districts to become comfortable with the evaluation. Once the framework was in statute, Stand for Children pursued conversations about how the evaluation was going to be used across the state because districts and charter schools use evaluations in different ways.

Stand for Children would like to see more certainty in how the evaluations are used and have alignment across the statutes. Evaluations are referred to many times and in many different ways, both at the district level, but particularly at the state level. With regards to consistency and balanced implementation across the state, Stand

for Children is hoping to implement the evaluations the Board adopted in the spring of 2011 into the various statutes that talk about evaluations, how they are used for professional development and decision making, and to ensure the language that is already there refers to one evaluation.

Ms. Hill commented that educators are subjected to multiple forms of evaluations, and there is some confusion in communities about how educators are evaluated. Stand for Children would like this to be the primary evaluation across all LEA's and will help with that conversation, as well as help with the focus on data collection so that stakeholders will know which instruments to look at when decisions are made at the state level.

With the framework adopted at the state level, schools and districts are adapting the framework to their needs and making decisions about how the framework is going to be used. Ms. Hill reminded the Board that ARS § 15-537 already requires a local evaluation to be made for improvement decisions, professional development, employment and compensation decisions. She reiterated that the language is already in the law and that Stand for Children is interested in making sure it all wraps around the ARS § 15-203 work that the Board and task force has been doing for over a year.

Implementation of the evaluation and how to move forward with LEA's in various states of readiness is an important issue for Stand for Children. An extension for the evaluation is required to be used in the next school year. Those districts that are ready do not want to be slowed down, and those that are not ready want some time to do it right. Staggering implementation would meet everyone's needs. If you're ready, go. If not, describe at the board level what your plan is to get ready. If a district is not ready, Stand for Children wants that district to have extra time so they and their community are ready to do the work.

Another important issue for Stand for Children is how to assure alignment across the state for all evaluation statutes. Stand for Children understands that it is mostly a statutory process so districts and charters know there is only one primary evaluation.

Stand for Children also supports the resolution of the issue regarding data. Governor Brewer's leadership on this issue has been strong and clear. Arizona needs good data systems. Supt. Huppenthal has been working very hard on this issue as well. In the meantime, there is data available. Districts are also generating data and Stand for Children thinks those who are ready to move forward should be allowed to do so.

Ms. Hill continued by stating that there are other issues in terms of technical assistance and having some frameworks and assessments that districts can borrow from each other. The regional support centers and county superintendents are doing a lot of work in this area.

Ms. Hill concluded by stating that whatever Stand for Children can do in terms of education or different policy initiatives, they would like to support them and ensure that next steps are attached to timelines that make sense. Some people need more time, but the whole thing cannot be put off forever. As everyone works towards the PARCC assessment and towards having data with integrity, they still need to make sure evaluations are ready. What Stand for Children is doing right now is talking to folks about sensible timelines to make sure that the evaluations are tied to the context of all the work that is already going on.

Lastly, Ms. Hill stated that Stand for Children appreciates the work of the State Board, the Governor's P-20 Council and the Governor's Office, and they want to work in coordination with all of these partners.

9:53am - Vice President Tyree introduced Ms. Sigmund, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Arizona Charter Schools Association.

Ms. Sigmund stated that one of ACSA's priorities is authorizer accountability. Arizona received \$45 million for 92 new schools which could be in jeopardy if ACSA does not have authorizer accountability, where authorizers look to academic achievement as their number one priority in authorizing charters, reviewing charters and renewing charters. ACSA is working with ADE, the State Board for Charter Schools, and members of ACSA to draft broad language similar to that seen at the national level. ACSA is also working with the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools and the National Association for Charter School Authorizers.

The other two areas that the ACSA is paying close attention to is student achievement data and student per pupil funding data.

B. Presentation and discussion regarding legislative affairs. Discussion may include, but is not limited to, possible initiatives for the 2012 legislative session.

Mr. Yanez
Ms. Cannata

9:55am - Mr. Yanez stated that there are four items that have come up several times in the past few Board meetings and that he was going to be providing the Members with some additional information regarding those four items.

The first topic dealt with the proposed language for two legislative initiatives, beginning with the Board's conversation regarding intervention in financially troubled school districts. As was presented last month, the proposal is to look at the Board's two existing mechanisms for intervention: receivership and fiscal crisis teams. The goal is to provide the Board with more leeway in terms of which intervention is more appropriate.

The way both laws are structured is very rigid. Receiverships can be used for insolvency, which is specifically defined in statute as mismanagement. Fiscal crisis teams can be used in situations of over-expenditure. There is a hard line between the two.

The Members were given a document that contains proposed language for how to address providing the board with more flexibility between those two laws. ARS § 15-103(b) adds language to the existing receivership law that would indicate that in those situations of insolvency or mismanagement, should the Board choose to, it could appoint a fiscal crisis team to one of those school districts. There is some technical language which attaches operational requirements and some authority to those fiscal crisis teams so that there is clear understanding of how it would work.

As mentioned last month, one example is Cedar Unified School District which had issues of mismanagement. The initial recommendation was for the Board to appoint a fiscal crisis team, but because over-expenditure did not exist, the Board had to go to the extreme in terms of intervention and appoint receiver. Now that district is in receivership.

Every year there are a couple of districts that find themselves in dire financial situations which requires Board or legislative intervention. The proposed language is an attempt to provide the Board with more flexibility in how they roll out intervention.

Mr. Yanez concluded by stating that he was looking for some discussion and consensus around this proposal so that he and Ms. Cannata can take it to the Legislature.

Supt. Huppenthal mentioned that when the Board sends in a receiver, that receiver might cost \$300,000. Supt. Huppenthal clarified that the proposal is an effort to migrate to another option that is more flexible and less onerous for a school district that is in trouble. Supt. Huppenthal stated that he was trying to get a sense of what

the Board would establish instead of sending in a receiver.

Mr. Yanez replied by confirming that when a district goes into receivership, the first year of operations for the receiver is very expensive; typically over \$300,000 for the first year because of certain requirements built into the law that the receiver has to perform. For example, the 120 day report. Furthermore, most receivers make between \$175 to \$250 an hour, which adds up quickly. All of this is happening in a district that is already over budget or over-expended. This makes intervention and the receiver's job difficult because they are taking over a district in dire straits, but the receiver has to budget their own expenditures into whatever is remaining for the fiscal year.

Fiscal crisis teams have never been used because they are so prescriptive in terms of when the Board can use those teams. Those teams are still fairly expensive, but the duties that come with fiscal crisis teams, as compared to a receiver, are much less. There are two types of fiscal crisis teams. The first is a monitoring team that works with the district, provides advice and nudges the district along in the right direction. That will be much more effective in a school district that perhaps has good leadership, but found itself in a tough situation. Another level of fiscal crisis team comes with more authority in terms of directing the operations of the school district.

Mr. Yanez stated that every receiver that the Board has put in place has been successful in righting the ship and getting the district out of receivership. However, in all the cases, receivership has been extended because it is difficult to right the ship when budgeting \$300,000 a year for a receiver in a small district. If fiscal crisis teams are in the law, it can be done more quickly and cheaper.

Vice President Tyree asked of whom the fiscal crisis team would be comprised.

Mr. Yanez replied that the process for selecting a fiscal crisis team is almost identical to the process for selecting a receiver and that the list of approved fiscal crisis teams is similar to the list of approved receivers. The Board was required by statute to set up that list. The Board put out an RFP and individuals and firms applied, providing they met the basic minimum criteria. It is typically the case that some of those individuals or firms have expertise in school finance.

Supt. Huppenthal commented that he thought it was an excellent recommendation for dealing with what the Board knows is a severe problem in some situations. He asked that the Board remain open to a third option: linking up an excellent school with one that is floundering.

Mr. Yanez replied that in some instances the Board has done that and the Board would certainly be open to something along those lines.

10:05am - Mr. Yanez then moved on to present information regarding the restructuring of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee (PPAC). Restructuring the PPAC does not involve legislative changes, but it does involve rule changes and a budget proposal. A budget proposal was submitted that would provide the Investigative Unit with two additional FTE's. The Board has a copy of that proposal. Having two more investigators in the unit will take the caseload down to what it was ten years ago, which is still high, but puts the Investigative Unit in a place where they can move their more serious cases forward in a more timely manner.

Assuming the proposal is awarded, the PPAC would then need to restructure its existing process. The committee that does the hearings is just one committee made up educators from around the state who are volunteers. They typically meet twice a month. Should the Investigative Unit have additional staff to produce more cases, they would need an additional committee so they can adjudicate cases in a timely manner.

The rule proposal makes changes to the existing PPAC structure. It gives the Board an opportunity to appoint

multiple committees to do that work. Operationally, from the outside, it would not look different, but the PPAC could have four hearing days a month rather than the two they are limited to right now.

There are some other technical changes to the proposed rules that are really just catching the rules up to the current laws and standards. The most substantive change is language that takes out the requirement that the PPAC look at what was the national code of ethics at the time when the rule was created. That code of ethics still exists, but since the rule was adopted, legislation was written that required the Board to have its own code of ethics. The Board has had that new code of ethics for the last seven or eight years.

Vice President Tyree asked if the additional PPAC committee would have the same responsibilities with respect to the type of cases they would hear, or if they would be constituted on a regional basis or listen to certain types of issues.

Mr. Yanez replied that both committees would perform identical functions. As things roll out that may change, but because the PPAC agendas change so much from month to month, in terms of management, the committees would do identical work.

Vice President Tyree asked, in terms of the volunteers on the committee, if the Board would consider expanding the membership to go outside the education community.

Mr. Yanez replied that it is the Board's rule and however the Board wants to structure that committee it can. There are seven members, five from the education community, and two lay members, one of whom is a retired police officer

Ms. Klein commented that if cases involve allegations of criminal conduct, the committee should be required to include law enforcement. Ms. Klein further commented that there does not seem to be any requirements for automatic penalties depending on the violation. She asked if the Board could consider having certain codes of conduct which would require an automatic finding.

Mr. Yanez replied that other states do have something similar to that, but he would have to defer to Ms. Anderson, Assistant Attorney General, as it presents some due process issues. Mr. Yanez stated that he would be happy to have those conversations with legal counsel.

Supt. Huppenthal commented that the Board should reach out to the Arizona Education Association because what happens when the Board discusses these types of issues is, even if they result in good policies, teachers feel victimized because they were not included in the conversation.

10:13am - Mr. Yanez continued by stating that the last issue in terms of revamping the investigative process deals with the policy manual for the unit. Based on previous conversations, the Board will make amendments to those internal policies to include attempts by investigators to ensure that victims' rights are part of the process and incorporated into the materials.

Ms. Klein asked if there is a reason why a victims' rights representative is not automatically part of the committee.

Mr. Yanez replied that the Board can make amendments to the membership of the committee, although he was not sure how that member would be categorized. Based on previous conversations, the Board can look at the investigative process and make sure there is an opportunity for victims to provide something to the board, but the Board can also look at the structure of the committee itself.

Ms. Klein added that it is important for victims to have the opportunity to participate in appearing before the Board, and that there should be a section in the policy manual that spells out what the victims' rights due process is. However, the board should also contemplate whether it would be appropriate to have a victims' rights expert as part of the committee.

Mr. Yanez stated that regarding the issue of victims' rights, the Board can look at putting something in the rules. The reason there is not already language regarding this issue in the rules is because the investigative process is not in the rules, it is only an internal policy.

Mr. Yanez stated that his intention is to monitor what happens in terms of budget and resources. He will initiate a rules package, but there is no point in restructuring the PPAC if they do not have the resources. However, the other changes can be made.

10:18am - Mr. Yanez continued with his two remaining items, the first of which dealt with how to implement a mechanism that would provide for more speedy interventions in D schools. Mr. Yanez and Ms. Cannata are having difficulty crafting language that is true to the Board's intent, which is to quickly intervene if there is a school labeled D and unlikely to come out of D status in two years.

The trick is how to define the criteria for when to know if a school is not likely to improve through the existing improvement process, and to then intervene. The language would still try to honor the existing school improvement process that is in AZ Learns, but would also address when it could be decided, based on good data, that the school is going to have trouble coming out of D status. Mr. Yanez stated that he and Ms. Cannata would like to work with stakeholders and Board leadership between now and the next Board meeting to make sure the language is exactly right.

Mr. Yanez added that part of the discussion is to have three years of data in the A-F system before implementing the new language.

Supt. Huppenthal stated that the ADE is an active participant in the discussions, and the ADE has done an extensive literature search to see what has worked nationally. The literature is dismal, and indicates that intervention might result in things going downhill instead of the upside. There is not much guidance from around the country and the Board needs to be cautious as it steps forward because lots of ideas have been tried and not found to do well.

Mr. Miller commented that students should not be held hostage for three years in a nonconforming environment before the Board moves in to change things. As Supt. Huppenthal pointed out, sometimes change is worse than the process. The Board needs to make that kind of recommendation because it has a responsibility to those students sitting in those classrooms.

Mr. Yanez replied that with regards to waiting three years, this proposal does not mean the system slows down. For this new authority to intervene more quickly, the Board would want three years of data in the existing system. The data in the A-F system is different than the data in the legacy system.

Ms. Klein commented that there will be a legislative remedy this session for failing schools, and it will be to expand the education empowerment scholarships, which will not reach all of the children. The Board needs to address how to accelerate the system, because schools will need resources. The Board needs to identify what it can do to make sure a D school has the knowledge and resources it needs in order to do a turnaround.

10:29am - Mr. Yanez presented his last item regarding the proposal to delay the implementation of the teacher

evaluation framework. This is an item that the Board will be asked to weigh in on at the Legislature because it is their framework. Supt. Huppenthal outlined his proposal which is a one year delay, and there had been discussion earlier in today's meeting about a one year delay with additional criteria attached. Mr. Yanez asked for there to be further discussion about the idea of a delay and how to address it with the Legislature.

Supt. Huppenthal stated that it is important to achieve consensus about specific instruments and policies regarding how to go about evaluating teachers, so that a recommendation can be made to all schools and school districts, while allowing them to set that aside and go to their school boards so they still have local control. The goal is to have a scientifically based consensus about what an optimal policy would be and allow for variations around that.

Supt. Huppenthal added that there is empirical data coming in from a number of sources which suggests strongly that there is new stuff out there. For example, the Tripod Project, funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, is very powerful. Gallup, Inc. has a similar initiative which is solidly grounded in empirical data. The key is linking it all together; academic gains, assessments and coming right back into the classroom. There is a conflict between Gallup and Tripod. They are two different approaches, two powerful presentations, but they are not in concert.

Supt. Huppenthal further stated that there is further conflict with what is coming from the education culture, approaching a consensus from a third direction which does not have the empirical data that the other candidates have been working on for decades. Supt. Huppenthal stated that this needs to be squared up to bring these three bodies of work together and then still allow for local control.

Ms. Klein said that she is very concerned about there being a delay. Task forces decided what the structure would look like, and it is one thing if a structure has been decided upon and it is simply that school districts are not ready. Ms. Klein recalled that Ms. Hill, from Stand for Children, mentioned earlier in the meeting that there is a path for how to proceed. But, Ms. Klein continued, if it is the Board that does not know what to do, she is concerned.

Ms. Klein urged the Board to have those conversations because it is her concern that an outright delay would be another year that the framework will not get done. The Board needs to be clear about their expectations and build on the work of the task forces. This is a very important policy objective, and there are tremendous leaders out there who know how to do this very well. The Board should not be in a position to hold them back.

Vice President Tyree asked if it was a matter of having enough time for implementation or if there are other issues that need to be resolved so that people can put something in place. For example, creating awareness of what the Board's expectations are, or the Board having a firm grasp on the expectations. Another piece is to look at what things are in place already that are necessary for people to successfully implement the framework. As far as rural areas go, people are still struggling to put something in place. One of the worst things the Board could do is have a new rule where local boards would have to sign off or validate that their school district has implemented the new framework, and then in the end they do not do what the Board would like to see happen. What is the Board's expectation in having those met? Having the ability to assist school districts with putting it in place is also very important.

Mr. Miller stated that the Board had a task force that it worked with on this issue for fourteen or fifteen months that came back with recommendations for the Board to adopt that were in compliance with legislative requirements and timelines. The Board sped up its timeline by the maximum amount of time for forming the framework and then implementing it in the field.

Mr. Miller stated that he has real sympathy for the information and data that is coming out that Supt.

Huppenthal is talking about, but the Board also needs to move forward with a reasonable implementation plan. As data comes out the Board can always reconvene the subcommittee, look at the information and make suggestions and changes to the process or framework as they go forward. Mr. Miller agreed with Ms. Hill's recommendations that if there are some districts that are not ready, give them extra time to implement the framework, and give them the resources from the state to do that.

Supt. Huppenthal said that there are a lot of districts and schools that are doing intense teacher evaluations right now, and there are others ready to roll out. Supt. Huppenthal's concern is that when he looks, for example, at the impact standards, they have a total of 175 sub-standards, which raises the question of what is the empirical background and who has taken those sub-standards into the evaluations and, lastly, what have the results been to the education culture? In a sense, the Board is rolling out with stuff that Supt. Huppenthal would like to go to some specific case studies and be able to see that the district did this and academic gains were higher, teacher job satisfaction was higher, and that it predicts a better outcome.

Supt. Huppenthal thinks that as a board, they want to get some kind of understanding as to how these issues are being interpreted out in the field, and if the results are acceptable and they seem to be in line, then Supt. Huppenthal has no problem with the Board moving forward in a mandate environment. The Board is in a situation now where some people are ready to move, and they can go ahead and move. A lot of people are saying this is confusing stuff and they need direct and explicit guidance from the Board.

Supt. Huppenthal would like for the Board to be able to square this all up and make some very definitive decisions. What he would suggest is that the Board come back with a specific timeline for going through and doing the analysis, making the recommendations and proceeding from there.

Vice President Tyree stated that he agrees with Mr. Miller that the Board has spent a lot of time putting this together, and it is a critical framework. The devil is in the details, and that is where the issues are right now. The Board has a solid framework which may need tweaking, but there needs to be some time taken to work out the details. That is what he was hearing and some people suggested the Board take some time to do it. The Board needs to be prescriptive with a timeframe so they do not have people say that this goes on and on.

Mr. Yanez informed the Members that the framework right now allows for flexibility in incorporating survey data, if a district or charter wishes to do so. The ADE is working on a sample instrument that school districts or charters can use that might incorporate some of that work. Mr. Yanez said he is a bit confused in terms of how or what would be needed to allow Tripod or Gallup to move forward.

Supt. Huppenthal replied that ADE needs to square things up internally because there had been a committee going forward separately while others did the literature review. The Board needs to get to the point where they can make a specific recommendation to schools and school districts about instruments, which districts can then take and set aside if they are doing other things. A lot of times, districts rely on the Board's recommendations. Right now, with the impact standards and other things going on, it is a confusing picture with which to guide them. What the Board has seen in the past is when they have not provided specific guidance they can end up with a real mess. With things going in a lot of different directions, things could move forward that are hurtful to teachers. Supt. Huppenthal would like to have real clarity as the Board moves along on this.

Mr. Miller said that he has a problem with talking about specific recommendations; it becomes one size fits all. That is not what this is about; this is not the Board's job or role. If it is an ADE issue, Supt. Huppenthal has full control and it does not impact the Board. Mr. Miller reiterated that he is not a one size fits all advocate. Mr. Miller stated that he also has concerns with the presentation from Ms. Hill. Mr. Miller does not want ADE to take on the attitude of there being only one position.

Supt. Huppenthal agreed and stated that he is obsessed with local control. Districts do not need a specific recommendation, they need a clear recommendation.

Ms. Hamilton said that teachers know the framework is coming. Right now teachers are in limbo, but they cannot continue in limbo. Teachers do not want something that is not going to work. They are looking for models, not just a recommendation that fits within their district. If there are models, teachers can move forward more quickly.

Mr. Yanez stated that the problem is with group B teachers. There is a time difficulty with regards to making sure there is valid and reliable assessment data for 65% - 70% of teachers that do not have it yet. The primary issue is centered on getting good data for teachers who fall out of the AIMS universe; they fall back on school level data.

Vice President Tyree stated that he is not sure there is consensus yet and that at the next meeting there should be further discussion regarding the time frame and what to use for data. He asked Supt. Huppenthal if that would be enough time to look at what he was referring to regarding Gallup and Tripod.

Supt. Huppenthal stated that the Board has got to get this moving. They are waiting for models, and on Group B, but people are ready and the Board should give them the signal to move forward.

Mr. Yanez said that, based on the discussion, it was his understanding that the Board would be okay with a delay as long as it was specific and districts could opt in. The delay was not for the entire state, but if a school wants to delay for a year, they can do so.

Vice President Tyree asked if it was really the case that there is some number of people ready to go forward. His sense is that there are a lot of people looking for the Board to provide support.

Mr. Yanez said that it depends on a school district's comfort level with using only school-level data for group B teachers. That is how Mr. Yanez accounts for the variance in who is ready and who is not.

Vice President Tyree said that regional service centers want to provide support, but those things are in progress and are not there yet.

C. Presentation and discussion regarding the Arizona education reform awareness campaign, *Arizona Ready*

Ms. Gau

10:52am - Ms. Gau, Director of the Governor's Office of Education Innovation, passed out folders to the Members and introduced a flyer intended for parents or employees which communicates the message that there are specific, rigorous goals in Arizona which will help students be ready for life. There is also a form for individuals to sign up for the Supporter's Wall on the AZ Ready website. Many people have posted on that wall that they do not want Arizona to be ranked in the 40's anymore. The new council can provide collaboration, a rigorous look at the goals and rigorously measure the goals. The website provides a great opportunity for the public to see those goals and the progress being made on those goals, and show their support. There are folks out there that want us to do this work.

Another flyer describes the goals, gives some background and lists action items for the community and how it can help to raise the level of discourse and collaboration. There is also a Spanish language version being produced. Many schools and districts have requested speakers to come and share the information with staff and parent action committees.

10:56am - Mr. Masterson, ADE Chief Information Officer, said that his department had some great successes over the last weeks. Two weeks ago, they upgraded database servers without an impact to customers. They have increased processing time from five days to less than two days, which allows integrity to be run twice a week, and they have brought the databases up to support. The integrity reporting tool had been broken for eleven months, but was fixed last week. The School District Employee Report (SDER) tool was also fixed. These are two major things that have helped customers.

Mr. Masterson's office has started building a business case for the AELAS. They have a team on board who is working with school districts out in the field. Mr. Masterson promised the Board real time integrity capability by February or March. Right now they are taking the business rules apart and matching them with law.

Mr. Masterson's office has also kicked off a steering group in the agency, which is using district finance offices out in the field to validate business rules. How long it takes to complete this process will determine when Mr. Masterson can rewrite integrity and make it real time. He is hoping to make good, fast paced progress. The goal is to get it in front of the Board to be approved and in front of the Legislature.

Mr. Masterson introduced Andrew Larson, an intern from ASU, who is going through the business rules and matching them with the law.

Andrew Larson said he has been brought on by IT to help map legislation on the SAIS. He is working through integrity where they have a list of around 300 business rules all relating to membership, SPED, ELL, and federal and state data reporting requirements. They have nearly all the business rules cited directly to statute. The remaining rules mostly have incomplete rule descriptions, and they are working with school finance to figure out what those are. The next step in the process is working with the steering group and school finance to validate that the rules reflect the legislation that is cited. The next step includes aggregation and transaction.

Supt. Huppenthal asked for an example of a specific business rule and the legislation behind it. It would be helpful to the Board to understand how this is all playing out.

Mr. Masterson said his office would make that available at the next meeting. They will probably be closer to making some recommendations at that time as well.

Mr. Masterson continued his presentation. He let the Board know how much has been spent so far and that all expenditures have been fully documented to ensure full transparency. The main structure behind the architecture allows whatever needs to be deployed to be deployed.

The visibility of data is critical for us to be able to implement anything as simple as Ed Facts or courses and how teachers are doing or how principals are doing on their evaluations. Today data is only visible to each of the vendor systems. Ultimately the cost to bringing all that data here is difficult because of all the different standards between different systems. It is very complex. To get real true quality, they have to have a single source of truth.

We are going to manage the risk, so they are working with districts to ensure they are involved. They are also working with vendors, and asking for their input. The goal is to provide a business case with a one year return. The business case kicked off this month. They are in the middle of meeting with school districts and finding out costs, talking to principals and superintendents about what their needs are, and talking to teachers. They want to make this system vendor agnostic, and a pay for service model, and they want to be able to plug into

any educational technology that is out there. The one most pending is the PARCC assessment.

They have secured a company called LearningMate and are asking the Board to approve what the Data Governance Commission asked for, which is \$826,720. Mr. Masterson is going to re-categorize everything and then show the total spent and the total amount being asked for. Mr. Masterson's team has come a long way in the last five months in terms of planning and putting structure around this, and with creating program controls with risk and communication issues managed and addressed at the right time.

Today, ADE cannot talk to school districts very efficiently, and school districts cannot talk to ADE efficiently either. This disrupts the fluidity of being able to communicate with the state. What identity management will allow for is to federate to whoever is out there. Using whatever system they have, as long as they are using adopted standards, we can federate them so they will not have to use a bunch of different passwords. Based on who they are they get role based access. For example, if the user is authorized as a teacher, they will see only what a teacher can see. To make that happen, a lot of things have to go on. FERPA laws will be strictly followed.

Supt. Huppenthal clarified that the vision is that a teacher can sit down and identity management will make sure we are complying with FERPA, but they can look at their students in a variety of ways. They will immediately know who their students are before school starts, look at student's historical trends, challenges going forward, opportunities they may have, and there does not need to be 2000 systems out there to get all of that information to this one place.

Mr. Masterson confirmed that that is the case, if not even simpler than that. When a teacher logs in there will be some type of dashboard to help the teacher focus on students that may need the most help. This will give us an opportunity to take education to another level because we can identify, for example, what traits cause drop outs so we can address that problem.

Mr. Masterson stated that he is making an initial request for phases one, two and three in the amount of \$800,000. That will bring this agency up to speed with identity management and sets the stage for phase four, which is federating. The goal is to have phases one, two and three implemented by the end of June.

Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) is the standard for all IT in the world. In order to deliver support, ITIL needs to be implemented. This is a tool that is being used to implement the process, then we have to train users, and then implement throughout. This will bring accountability and visibility to all support.

One of the goals of the modernization effort is to provide visibility to the data. They are on schedule to deploy the first version of exposing this data to customers that will be user-friendly. The initial ask for this is \$72,600.

They are also linking courses to a national standard. Once the courses are mapped, they can assign a teacher to a course, and then match students to that course. This is a critical task to get done. The federal government gave until December of 2012 to map courses in all the state. The tool to carry this out costs \$199,500.

Great Plains is implementing a financial system to make ADE have one financial system that talks to the state financial system. They are consolidating the system into one financial package which is Great Plains. Ultimately, the SAIS payment system will interface into the Great Plains system, which will make for more visibility. The cost is \$472,920 which could change based on business requirements. They might be adding components for better visibility. Great Plains is on target.

SAIS is being re-engineered because sometimes the number that goes in is not the same as the number that comes out. In business, that might be overlooked. But in government, discrepancies like that need to be

explained. So they are taking SAIS apart and mapping it to a business process. For this piece, they are requesting \$1,497,726.

Supt. Huppenthal said that the new system will be able to show specific numbers and have an audit trail. Right now that trail does not exist.

Mr. Masterson said that individual districts build their own systems so they know what ADM is. If they trusted the state system they would not have to do that.

Application Lifecycle Implementation (ALM) is a structured process that turns this place from a development to engineering. Build to a standard. ADE cannot afford to rely on one person to have the knowledge. For this piece, they are requesting \$109,725.

The Data Governance Commission's budget recommendation was \$3.578 million, but they are asking the Board to approve \$4,078,021. They were given a total of \$6 million from the Legislature, which would leave \$2 million to roll over.

*Mr. Miller moved to authorize expenditures in the amount of \$4,078,021 as requested.
Second by Mr. Rottweiler*

Mr. Moore asked, with regards to the process for defining technology systems across the state school districts and ADE, which involves conducting interviews in the field to find out what is available, whether or not the information will be made available to constituents outside the structure; end users and what is ultimately available to end users.

Mr. Masterson said that the goal of the business case is to find out what the requirements are of three different groups and what they are currently using. If what they are currently using does not match their requirements that will be documented. They cannot do the whole state, so they have picked through regional superintendent recommendations and business community groups' recommendations to come up with a large enough sample size. It is also critical that those same people that developed the requirements sit on the RFP panel so they know it is built based on their requirements and they get to pick a vendor based on their requirements.

Mr. Moore clarified that his questions was really in regards to providing information for the PARCC assessment and some other assessments. Although that is a separate discussion, he is concerned about making sure rural schools have access.

Mr. Masterson replied that he sits on the state's broadband council and Mr. Moore's concern is something that is very much the concern of the broadband council.

Motion passed unanimously

Dr. Rottweiler requested a report for higher education constituents about how what is happening relates to them.

Ms. Klein asked Mr. Masterson to create an implementation score card to help expedite the discussion at future meetings.

Mr. Masterson replied that he will provide the visibility Dr. Rottweiler was requesting.

E. Presentation and discussion regarding NCLB Waivers

Ms. Morley

11:36am - Ms. Morley stated that ADE filed the intent with the United States Department of Education to apply for a waiver from the NCLB requirements. The request to waive is not just for the AYP, there are several requirements under NCLB law that would be waived, the majority of which deal with identifying schools for improvement and what corrective action will be taken. There is some flexibility in how the funds are used under all the different title programs authorized under NCLB.

11:38am - Ms. Klein departed.

The waiver allows the state to set up a different way to have differentiated accountability rather than just the AYP. It will still be called adequate yearly progress, but the state is allowed to identify different annual measurable objectives that schools have to reach in order to meet AYP. The state is able to set its objectives for each year and there are several options for NCLB. The AYP says to have 100% proficiency by a certain year, and ADE can set some type of goal like that, or it can do percentage increases every year to hit those AMO's.

There are also different ways of identifying schools. In the waiver application it is priority focused and rewards schools. Not only would the waiver identify schools that are low performing, but it also wants states to identify schools that are high performing and high growth. ADE must establish methodology in order to identify which schools are high growth and which schools are high performing. Those schools that may not be high performing can also be identified as rewards schools. It does not require the state to reward them, but identify them and set up a system where at some point the state could provide incentives or rewards to those types of schools.

The priority and focus schools are two different ways of identifying schools that are low performing. One is more of the traditional low performing, low proficiency and the other is who has the biggest gaps. The federal government identifies by ethnicity or gender, and we would need to show where the achievement gaps are, and where the biggest gaps are. We also have to identify where the highest achieving students and lowest achieving students are in the same school. The waiver application allows for several different options for creating a methodology. There is not a lot of guidance, it just wants us to show how we are going to identify them and make sure it is research sound and able to be supported.

Ms. Morley has been reviewing the submitted application for clues as to where we are going with this. This is a very big opportunity for the state to align state accountability with federal accountability. The biggest difference is that our state accountability system does not look at subgroups and achievement gaps, and growth in those groups. The federal government does require that we do that. That is probably the biggest adjustment, even if we just took the A-F system, our AZ Learns system, we would have to modify it in order to account for those differences.

Mr. Miller asked if the new system formula for A-F accountability, which concentrates the growth issues at 60% - 25%, if that would accommodate that issue.

Ms. Morley replied that it would accommodate part of it, but all of the subgroups that we are required to report on include all the racial, ethnic, gender and poverty categories. We have to report on all of those under NCLB, and we have to do it for AYP as well right now. It would not just be our low performing students. We would have to show growth in those subgroups in each school, the performance in each school by subgroup. We do that now for federal reporting. The only time we do not have to, is when you are a small school and have such a low number, fewer than 10 or 20, which is a 0, because it is too small of a group for it to be statistically valid. It would be the same under any different system.

Supt. Huppenthal asked how the initial group of states dealt with a subgroup issue and their treatment.

Ms. Morley replied that most states account for subgroup, but most made slight tweaks in order to do that. It is not that we would have to change the law, unless we wanted subgroup performance to reflect in the grade, but we have to report on subgroups. The information is available, because we have to report at the federal level. For achievement gaps and growth, and closing gaps, for it to reflect in the letter grade, there would possibly need to be a statutory change.

- F. Presentation, discussion and consideration to adopt passing scores for the following Arizona Educator Proficiency Assessments: Ms. Amator
1. Reading Content Exams (Grades K-8)
 2. Reading Content Exams (Grades 6-12)

11:45am - Ms. Amator reminded the Board that they adopted rules for the reading endorsement and asked for alternatives to the 21 semester hours required. This agenda item is in response to that request. The test development process involves numerous steps to ensure that tests are customized for the Arizona educational context, that it is aligned to Arizona education standards and that it is judged to be important and appropriate for assessing the knowledge and skills that would be equivalent to the 21 semester hours that this test will waive. During the development of this endorsement exam the testing vendor, a group of Evaluations Systems created by Pearson Education Inc., consulted Arizona documents, collaborated with Arizona educators, validated each reading endorsement, tested objectives in multiple ways, and engaged Arizona reading educators in providing professional judgments concerning the passing standards for this exam.

The Advisory Committee recommends setting the passing score for the AEPA Reading Endorsement for grades K-8 content exam at the multiple choice section score of 64, and the panel based constructed response section score of 6.

The Advisory committee recommends setting the passing score for the AEPA Reading Endorsement for grades 6-12 content exam at the multiple choice section score of 68, and the panel based constructed response section score of 6.

Supt. Huppenthal moved to accept the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and adopt the passing scores for the AEPA Reading Exam for Grades K-8 with a panel-based multiple choice score of 64 and a constructed response section score of 6, and for the AEPA Reading Exam for Grades 6-12 with a multiple choice score of 68 and a constructed response section score of 6.

Second by Mr. Miller

Motion passed unanimously

- G. Presentation, discussion and consideration to accept the proposed settlement agreements to suspend the teaching certificates held by the following individuals: Mr. Easaw
1. Johnny London
 2. Aaron S. Farabaugh

11:52am - Supt. Huppenthal departed.

Mr. Easaw stated that Mr. London and his council were present. Essentially, Mr. London has had several missteps, the culmination of which brought him to the attention of the Investigative Unit. They have put together a settlement agreement and are asking the Board to adopt the recommendation adopted by the PPAC, to retroactively suspend Mr. London's certificate for two years. The record of that would go to the national database which would notify all states and territories that this board has taken this action against his certificate.

Mr. Bill Holder, council for Mr. London, added that the settlement agreement required Mr. London to attend a seminar on professional boundaries. He has completed that seminar.

Mr. London feels that he has been a good educator over the last 14 years. Being under investigation for the past two years has painted his teaching career in a negative light, and he would like to get back to helping children.

Mr. Moore moved to accept the proposed settlement agreement to suspend the teaching certificates held by Mr. Johnny London.

Second by Mr. Miller

Members Hamilton, Miller, Moore, Rottweiler and Tyree voted aye.

Member Ortiz-Parsons voted nay.

The motion did not pass and will be tabled until the next meeting.

Mr. Easaw stated that Mr. Farabaugh and his council, Mr. Martinez were present. Mr. Farabaugh has a certificate that expires in 2014. He was a teacher at Pinnacle High School, which is an online high school. In 2010 he resigned from his position because he sent an inappropriate text message to one of his students. The Investigative Unit determined that a settlement agreement might work. It was presented to the PPAC and accepted unanimously. They were impressed by the fact that Mr. Farabaugh brought the situation to the attention of the principal and that he accepted full responsibility for his actions.

Mr. Martinez stated that Mr. Farabaugh has attended the class on boundaries and that this was a one time lapse of judgment.

Mr. Farabaugh stated that it was one lapse in judgment, and that he was truly sorry and takes full responsibility.

Mr. Miller moved to accept the proposed settlement agreement to suspend the teaching certificates held by Mr. Aaron Farabaugh.

Second by Mr. Moore

Members Hamilton, Miller, Moore, Rottweiler and Tyree voted aye.

Member Ortiz-Parsons voted nay.

The motion did not pass and will be tabled until the next meeting.

H. Presentation, discussion and consideration to close the rulemaking record and adopt proposed rules R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, regarding Professional Teaching and Administrative Standards.

Mr. Yanez

12:06pm - Supt. Huppenthal returned, Mr. Miller departed.

Mr. Yanez stated that as the task force was working on the teacher and principal evaluation framework, it became apparent that there were two parts. One was the academic progress component, and the other was the observation component. The task force, at the time, turned to our existing professional teaching standards and our existing administrative standards. It was brought to their attention that those standards were based on national standards which were being reworked. In March, those national standards were updated. As the framework was working through the Board process, the Board had discussions about the need to realign

teaching standards with the new national standards.

This topic was initially presented to the Board by Dr. Balentine as part of her work as the chair of that task force, and then through the initiating of the rulemaking process. There were some initial amendments requested by Member Klein. Those amendments were added, rulemaking was initiated and there was a public hearing on September 16th, where there were no additional comments to the proposed rules. What the Board has before them is a request to close the rulemaking record and adopt the proposed rules.

Mr. Moore moved to close the rulemaking record and adopt proposed rules R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, regarding Professional Teaching and Administrative Standards.

Second by Ms. Ortiz-Parsons

Motion passed unanimously

- I. Board comments and future meeting dates – The executive director, Mr. Molera, presiding officer or a member of the Board may present a brief summary of current events pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02(K) and may discuss future meeting dates and direct staff to place matters on a future agenda. The Board will not discuss or take action on any current event summary

5. ADJOURN AS THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND RECONVENE AS THE STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Supt. Huppenthal moved to adjourn as the State Board of Education and reconvene as the State Board for Vocational and Technological Education.

Second by Mr. Moore

Motion passed unanimously

Arizona Skills Standards Commission update on Technical Assessments and Workplace Skills

Mr. Hamilton

12:11pm - Mr. Hamilton, ADE Deputy Associate Superintendent of Career and Technical Education, provided some background information by stating that the Arizona Skills Standards Assessment System was created in response to the 2006 Carl Perkins legislation and subsequent Arizona State Plan, and the 2006 Arizona Joint Technological Education District legislation. Both pieces of legislation require that CTE students be assessed on industry validated standards leading to a CTE certificate at the end of the CTE program. In the last month 19,000 students were assessed, which is a landmark among states in the country.

The Arizona Skills Standards Commission (ASSC) is co-chaired by Supt. Huppenthal and Dr. Carolyn Warner. The Commission is primarily composed of business leaders in Arizona and a few education leaders. Each member has a high level of concern, high standards and high skills to support Arizona economic growth. The role of the Commission is to preside over the standards validation process and serve as a conduit to Arizona business and industry, and to issue skills standards certificates and transcripts of skills standards attainment to each student who passes their assessment. Another group that provides leadership for the CTE assessment system is the Stakeholders Committee, comprised of over 40 CTE administrators from around the state. Their job is to make sure that what is presented is workable at the local level.

The CTE assessment system is an online system housed at the ADE in the information technology department. The system provides opportunities for students to validate the knowledge and skills obtained in program areas.

Districts are expected to assess students twice; once as a practice assessment, and once as a final assessment. There are also some community colleges using the assessment because it is workforce entry level. After students submit a practice assessment, later in their term they also submit a final assessment as they near the end of their CTE program. Teachers can download a variety of reports and the feedback is given to the students and the instructors virtually immediately.

The information technology department at the ADE has provided a critical leadership role in the development and implementation of the online testing system. The ASSC values their continued leadership as they anticipate adding new features to the CTE system. The ADE current technology education section has been in partnership with Arizona State University's University College and Workforce Education and Development Office for the past five years in this development process. The focus has been on developing and implementing the CTE assessment system. Recently this partnership relocated to the University of Arizona.

Mr. Hamilton introduced Dr. Maggie Mangini, the Executive Director of ASU's Workforce Education and Development Office.

Dr. Mangini began by explaining that under the umbrella of the University of Arizona, located here at the Phoenix Center and the Phoenix Plaza, she and the other staff working with ASU are continuing to stay the course on the work regarding the CTE system.

December first ended the Fall 2011 testing period with 49 different program assessments and over 19,000 students assessed. Those are people who are preparing for the workforce through our schools and our CTE programs, who are then connected to the many hundreds of teachers with whom they are working and the hundreds of schools around Arizona.

The Stakeholders Committee can keep us in line. Each and every one of the program areas has an industry validation committee. Everything begins with that group who validates what students need to know, and what they need to do with what they know, in the workplace of that particular program area.

There are 49 different validation industry committees and each one of those has an item development committee composed of the hundreds of teachers around the state who are actually creating the assessment items. Dr. Mangini's office is looking at how students perform on those items, and the development committees are accessing those data for looking at their own curriculum, reflecting on their own instructional methodologies as they go.

The feedback loop is very important and it is done in real-time. Within thirty seconds of a student finishing the on-line test, they get a full report of how they performed on each standard in which they were assessed. At the same time the teacher is automatically emailed that individual student's report. Teachers and those who have access to the system at the site are able to look at how the group did and look at that in relation to the standards that were set by business and industry.

Our role now at UA, continuing from the ASU project, is to be on the development side of those items and assuring that we are looking at the reliability and validity of these items as we continuously improve them, which involves hundreds of teachers looking at them as well. Our role as a developer in partnership with the ADE CTE section becomes a working partnership in assuring that the delivery of CTE is what business and industry need for workforce development.

The 19,000 that took the test this fall is a big increase over Spring of 2011, which was a little over 15,000. We have not increased the number of tests, although we are in development to increase the number of programs that will be addressed. That is over 3,000 more students who took the test this fall. It is common to have most of

those students take it as a practice test. Teachers are now getting data back, and they will have information in front of them to improve instruction delivery for the Spring 2012 assessment, where most of the students will be taking it as their final assessment before they graduate.

The system ended at noon on December first and the ADE IT department and print shop were able to turn out letters of congratulations from the Commission and transcripts and certificates to almost 2,000 students. It is an incredible feat of immediate feedback.

Dr. Mangini introduced Dr. Warner, co-chair of the ASSC and President of Corporate Education, Inc.

Dr. Warner hoped that the presentation thus far indicated the difficulty of making all this come together. We have been working on it for a number of years and are beginning to be recognized across the country as a state that is leading in economic development through education. That is the objective of the ASSC: to work with prospective employers so that when young people apply for positions, they have a much better chance of getting the job, and that when they get the job, they have the skills in hand to do the work. The final stage is that they will be able to keep the job and advance in that particular position.

The Commission has begun to do what business and industry insisted we must do: give us young people with skills so that they can do the work. But more importantly, focus groups all around the state are telling us to teach them workplace etiquette and basic employability skills.

So we have undertaken the identification and development of assessments. This is going to be difficult because these are “soft skills,” but they must be assessed and we must know our young people who are applying for jobs have that capability. Therefore, we are working to develop industry validated assessments of the technical skills required in CTE, and we are working to begin a developmental process of developing assessment instruments and processes to assess and validate soft skills, or Arizona’s basic essential employability skills.

Of all of the skills efforts, this is probably the most diff. It cannot actually be assessed with a multiple choice test. Students have to know how to do the kinds of workplace essential skills that will enable them to not only keep the job and be a productive employee, but also to move upward in that job and to be able to grow and go into whatever world they wish to go into.

Dr. Warner stated that she is honored to serve with Supt. Huppenthal. He has worked so hard on this and comes from a world in which this makes good sense to him. Economic development in Arizona must, through CTE, be in such a position that we can assure employees are ready to go to work with workplace skills as well as essential employability skills to help Arizona’s economy move forward.

Dr. Warner introduced Mark Dobbins, Senior Vice President of Human Resources and General Affairs at SUMCO Phoenix.

Mr. Dobbins has been in manufacturing for over forty years. He chairs the AZ Chamber of Commerce and represents Arizona on the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM). Business appreciates the support and the initiative of the ASSC and the Board’s support in helping to draw out the efforts of CTE. We must create things of value and compete on a global basis. The Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry fully supports stem initiatives and will endorse any legislation aimed at improving performance.

In today’s economy you must have a high school diploma and the equivalent of at least two more years of post secondary education, as well as the prerequisite skills for the job. To keep a job, you must:

- Use deductive reasoning. In other words, the employer expects thinking skills.
- Communicate technical issues. In other words, complex communication.

- Support the well-being of the organization by contributing ideas and methods to improve productivity and efficiency, or creativity and innovation.
- Deal with people from every corner of the world. That is called cultural competency.
- Tell your business story in support of objectives. That is social networking for business.
- Be totally computer competent. Today's workplace runs on electronic communication and turns more information to more places in an hour than was produced in days and weeks in the past. That is called working on-line for geographically distributed teams.
- Be able to resolve problems by beginning of root cause and systematically walking through a solution, a.k.a. computational thinking.

Today's employee participates in their business. The price of entry in this participation is job skills plus the ability to participate, which we can now define in Arizona as being found in workplace employability skills.

As a member of the NAM Board of Directors in Washington, Mr. Dobbins works closely with the NAM Manufacturing Institute. The Institute has its own set of nationwide job skills certification targeted at the community college level. They have scheduled a meeting in mid December between ASSC and Emily DeRocco, who is president of the Manufacturing Institute, to begin a coordinated effort that will take the innovation from here in Arizona into a national dialogue.

12:41pm - Dr. Rottweiler departed. The Board lost its quorum and the meeting ended.